

BROOK M. HURD, et al.,	)	Case No. 2:16-cv-02011-GMN-NJK
Plaintiff(s),	)	
vs.	)	ORDER
CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT, et al.,	)	(Docket No. 27)
Defendant(s).	)	

Courts have broad discretionary power to control discovery. *See, e.g., Little v. City of Seattle*, 863 F.2d 681, 685 (9th Cir. 1988). The mere pendency of a dispositive motion is insufficient to stay discovery. *See, e.g., Kor Media Grp., LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581 (D. Nev. 2013). Rather, “a party seeking to stay discovery carries the heavy burden of making a strong showing why discovery should be denied.” *Id.* The parties in this case have not met this burden, as they have not even addressed the relevant standards. *See id.*; *see also* Docket No. 27. However, the parties have demonstrated good cause for the Court to grant the discovery plan that they have proposed in the alternative. *See id.* at 2-3.

Accordingly, the parties' stipulated proposed discovery plan and scheduling order, Docket No. 27, is **GRANTED** to the extent that it is consistent with this order. The discovery deadlines are as follows:

- Discovery cut-off date: November 1, 2017
- Amending the pleadings and adding parties: August 1, 2017
- Initial expert disclosures: September 1, 2017
- Rebuttal expert disclosures: October 2, 2017
- Dispositive motions: December 1, 2017
- Proposed joint pretrial order: January 2, 2018, or 30 days after the Court rules on any dispositive motions or further Court order

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: January 30, 2017



---

NANCY J. KOPPE  
United States Magistrate Judge